



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,333	08/23/2001	Kathrin Berlin	81669	7884

23685 7590 09/22/2005

KRIEGSMAN & KRIEGSMAN  
665 FRANKLIN STREET  
FRAMINGHAM, MA 01702

EXAMINER
----------

SWITZER, JULIET CAROLINE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,333

Applicant(s)

BERLIN, KATHRIN

Examiner

Juliet C. Switzer

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16, 18-24, 26, 27 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) -9, 11-16, 18-24, 26, 27, and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/13/05 has been entered.

2. This action is written in response to applicant's correspondence submitted 4/13/05 and 7/14/05. Claims 1, 26, 27 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-24, 26-27, and 30 are pending. Applicant's amendments and arguments have been thoroughly reviewed, but are not persuasive for the reasons that follow. Any rejections not reiterated in this action have been withdrawn. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. **This action is FINAL.**

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 19 and 20 are indefinite because the limitations of the claims set forth additional steps that are not within claim 1, and thus, the resulting claim fails to fall within the scope of claim 1. Claim 1 is drawn using the transitional phrase "consisting of" which means that the

Art Unit: 1634

steps recited in the method are practiced to the exclusion of additional steps. However, claims 19 and 20 add an additional step wherein product “is transferred to a different reaction vessels” and this confusing in view of the fact that claim 1 excludes methods with additional steps.

Claim 26 is indefinite over the recitation “thereby enabling the immobilization of the amplificate on a surface” because it is not clear if this is meant to be an active process step which requires that the amplificate is immobilized on a surface. The remainder of the body of the claim does not set forth an immobilization step, but the washing of step (e) appears to be reliant on such a step since it does not seem like it would be otherwise possible to wash away part of the nucleic acids but not others. It is particularly important to clarify this aspect of the method since the claims have been amended to recite “consisting of” language in the preamble, and so, if the immobilization is not particularly required, than it is in fact excluded from the scope of the claim. Clarification is required.

Claim 27 is indefinite over the recitation “thereby enabling the immobilization of the amplificate on a surface” because it is not clear if this is meant to be an active process step which requires that the amplificate is immobilized on a surface. The remainder of the body of the claim does not set forth an immobilization step, but if there is no such step, it is unclear how the chemical function in step (b) is relevant to the claim. Further in step (e) the “labeled or non-labeled nucleic acids” is confusing because it is not clear which label is being referred to since a label is added to some nucleic acid in step (a) and to heteroduplexes in step (e).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1-6, 8, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice *et al.* (Oncogene (1998) 17, 1807-1812) in view of Gifford (US 5750335).

Art Unit: 1634

Rice *et al.* teach a method for identifying 5-methylcytosine positions in a sample genomic DNA, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) chemically treating a sample genomic DNA obtained from at least one cell in such a way that cytosine and 5-methylcytosine react differently and from products with different base pairing behavior (p. 1811, treatment with sodium bisulfite);

(b) amplifying by means of a polymerase reaction a segment of the genomic DNA obtained in step (a) (p. 1811, second column);

(c) performing steps (a) and (b) on a reference genomic DNA (Figure 3, methylation was determined for eight different cell types, including normal lymphocytes and normal mammary epithelial cells);

Rice *et al.* utilize chemical treatment with sodium bisulfite in a method to identify the location of methylated cytosines in genomic DNA. Treatment with bisulfite results in the conversion of unmethylated cytosine residues to uracil, while methylated cytosine residues remain unchanged. Thus, in a sample where every cytosine was methylated there would be no change in sequence, but in a sample with very low levels of methylation, after PCR there would be thymines where the unmethylated cytosines previously were located. Rice *et al.* effectively introduce mutations nucleic acid sequences via the treatment with sodium bisulfite. When two treated samples are compared, for example a sample that was highly methylated versus one that had low levels of methylation, the treated sequences would have sequence differences at each position where there was differential methylation. Rice *et al.* utilize a sequencing method to determine the methylation positions after amplification of the sequences, comparing the sequences to the known BRAC1 sequence (p. 1811, 2<sup>nd</sup> column).

Art Unit: 1634

With regard to claim 2, in the method taught by Rice *et al.* positions which are variable between different cell lines are identified (see figure 3).

With regard to claim 3, Rice *et al.* utilize a bisulfite to treat the genomic DNA.

With regard to claim 4, Rice *et al.* jointly amplify genomic DNA from several cells, as they necessarily isolated DNA from more than one cell for each cell line.

With regard to claim 5, Rice *et al.* separately amplified the DNA from several cell lines, and then treated them all with bisulfite.

With regard to claim 8, Rice *et al.* test unmethylated cell lines (p. 1807, second column; Figure 3).

With regard to claim 18, a nucleotide sequence is considered a “chemical function” that enables a PCR product to be immobilized on a surface. Therefore, the PCR carried out by Rice *et al.* necessarily uses a primer that enables the polymerase reaction to be immobilized on a surface. The claim does not actually require an immobilization step.

Rice *et al.* do not detect the differences between amplified sequences by forming heteroduplexes from the amplified products for the comparison of a test and reference sample.

Gifford teaches a method for identifying sequence differences between two nucleic acids that comprises the steps of:

- (d) forming heteroduplexes from two different nucleic acid samples (Col. 3, lines 40-50);
- (e) introducing a detectable label into the heteroduplexes of step (d) by means of a reaction which is specific for non-complementary base pairs (Col. 4, lines 15-20), and
- (f) determining the position of mismatches in the sample genomic DNA based on the presence and position of the detectable label (Col. 4, lines 5-10, 20-25; also Col. 5, lines 1-12).

Art Unit: 1634

Gifford specifically teaches comparing a sample (patient) nucleic acid fragment with a control (normal) nucleic acid fragment (Figure 2).

With regard to claims 4 and 5, Gifford teaches that a test or reference nucleic acid may include monoclonal or polyclonal cell lines (Col. 9, 22-25).

With regard to claims 19, Gifford teaches that the reference or test nucleic acids may be immobilized to a solid surface (Col. 5, lines 1-5; col. 13, lines 1-5). With regard to claim 20, Gifford teaches that “different” reference nucleic acids may be immobilized on a solid surface at different spots, which are considered different reaction vessels (Col. 5, lines 1-5). Further, Gifford teaches the transfer of the amplified products to different vessels (affinity columns or affinity matrix) for purification of the heteroduplexes wherein the products are coupled to a solid support (column 5, lines 47-56).

With regard to claim 21 and 22, Gifford teaches an using an enzyme that forms a complex with a non-complementary base pair (Col. 4, lines 10-20), specifically teaching MutS (Col. 7, line 22).

With regard to claim 23, Gifford teaches a method wherein the enzyme bears a label by which a complex can be displayed (Col. 15, lines 65-67).

With regard to claim 24, Gifford teaches that the label is a fluorescence label (Col. 15, lines 65-66).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methylation detection method taught by Rice *et al.* so as to have utilized the mutation detection methods taught by Gifford. One would have been motivated to utilize the methods taught by Gifford in order to achieve the express benefits of the

Art Unit: 1634

methods taught by Gifford which include achieving “rapid and accurate genetic screening and diagnosis by comparing two nucleic acids for differences in their sequences...to locate previously unknown mutations of a nucleotide sequence, and to identify the sequence itself, where the nature and position of the mutation within a region of the genome is unknown, and where the location of the region itself is unknown (Col. 3, lines 25-40).” The combination would have resulted in a method “consisting of” the steps set forth in instant claim 1. For example, Gifford et al. specifically teach that the identity and position of the mismatch can be determined by determining the nucleotide sequence of the mismatch region. This is not an additional step from those recited in the claim, but simply one means by which step (f) can be accomplished. The sequencing suggested by Gifford et al. is “based on the presence and position” of the label insofar as the portion of nucleic acid to be sequenced in this case would be the portion that was labeled by the method. Likewise, as a different example, Gifford provide that the reference nucleic acids may be immobilized to a solid surface in an array, the test hybridized to the bound reference sequences, and these labeled with the mismatch binding proteins. In this embodiment, the bound hybrids are detected as an indication of the genetic variation between the test sample and the reference nucleic acid. The presence and position of the sequence difference has been determined, at least it is known that the mismatch is within hybrid that has been bound by the binding protein. With regard to claim 6, the result required in claim 6 would have been a necessary property of the practice of the assay taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford. Namely, where there was differential methylation between the sample genomic DNA and any of the reference DNA’s taught by Rice *et al.*, when these were subjected to heteroduplex analysis as



Art Unit: 1634

taught by Gifford erroneous base pairings would have been produced at the positions at which 5-methylcytosine was located in the sample genomic DNA but not in the reference genomic DNA.

5. Claims 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford as applied to claims 1-6, 8, and 18-24 above, and further in view of Koster *et al.* (US 6428955).

The teachings of Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford are applied herein as applied in the previous rejection. In the method taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford, sodium bisulfite is used which results in the modification of unmethylated cytosines, and therefore mismatches would occur among treated nucleic acids at positions where there was relative differential methylation of sequences. Thus, after bisulfite treatment, one is left with nucleic acids that have mismatches relative to one another if the sequences are differentially methylated. Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford do not teach a method in which the heteroduplex is detected by cleavage of the heteroduplex molecule or in which mass spectrometry is used to analyze the size of the DNA fragments.

Claim 26 differs from claim 1 in that in step (b) the PCR primer is fluorescently labeled and provided with a chemical function thereby enabling the immobilization of the amplificate on the surface, step (e) utilizes a chemical mismatch cleavage methodology, and step (f) utilizes mass spectrometry, whereby in step (g) the presence or presence and position of the 5-methylcytosine within the genomic DNA is deduced from the length of the cleaved nucleic acids. Claim 27 is similar to claim 26 but requires that a detectable label is introduced into the heteroduplex by an enzymatic reaction which is specific for non-complementary base pairs. This limitation is provided in the methods taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford.

Art Unit: 1634

Likewise, newly added claim 30 is similar to claim 26, and thus also similar to claim 1. Steps (a)-(d) of claim 30 are similar to those of claim 1. Unlike claim 1, however, claim 30 requires that the heteroduplexes of step (d) are cleaved by a chemical mismatch cleavage reaction. Claim 9 depends from claim 30 and requires that the nucleic acid backbone of the heteroduplex is specifically cleaved at the non-complementarily base paired positions by an enzymatic means. Claims 11-15 also depend from claim 30.

With regard to claims 11-14, Koster *et al.* teach methods for analyzing the size of nucleic acid fragments using mass spectrometry, specifically teaching the use of MALDI-TOF and ESI, (Col. 18, line 66-Col. 19, line 11).

With regard to claim 15, which requires that the nucleic acids in step (e) are “adapted” to the performance capacity of the mass spectrometer, Koster *et al.* teach utilizing a variety of PCR amplification methods to obtain PCR products that they analyze using the mass spec (See examples 14-15, for example). With regard to claim 16, Koster *et al.* teach utilizing nested PCR to amplify products for detection (Examples 5 and 14, for example), a method which uses primers that are set stepwise along the DNA with respect to the inner and outer pairs of primers and produce a series of amplification products, at least one which is within the mass range detectable by means of mass spectrometry. These PCR primers are considered to be “set stepwise” since they amplify two differently sized products where one is a size “step” down from the other.

Koster *et al.* teaches a method in which a heteroduplex is cleaved by an agent that cleaves the unhybridized portion so that a mismatch results in two products and then detecting these by mass spectrometry to detect the presence of the mismatch (Col. 5, lines 30-40; Col. 23, lines 25-

Art Unit: 1634

40). Koster *et al.* further teach primers that are labeled with biotin (a means for immobilizing an amplificate on a surface; col. 35, for example) and primers that are labeled with a radioactive label and oligonucleotides that are fluorescently labeled (Col. 49, for example). In addition, as noted previously in this office action, any nucleic acid sequence itself is considered a “chemical function” that would enable the immobilization of the amplificate on a surface. Claims 26 and 27 never actually require the immobilization of the amplificate on a surface, only that such immobilization is “enabled.” Nonetheless, Koster further teach methods in which the sequence to be detected is immobilized to a solid support by means of hybridization (Col. 3, lines 60-67).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford *et al.* so as to have used the amplification and detection methods taught by Koster *et al.* One would have been motivated to use mass spectrometry as a means for detection of nucleic acid fragments in order to take advantage of the express benefits of such a method as taught by Koster *et al.*, who state “the processes of the invention provide for increased accuracy and reliability of nucleic acid detection by mass spectrometry (Col. 5, lines 62-65).” One would have been motivated to use chemical cleavage to detect heteroduplexes by Koster’s specific suggestion to do so, and in order to take advantage of an additional method for detecting sequence differences among the potentially differentially methylated sequences taught by Rice *et al.* Furthermore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to have utilized fluorescently labeled primers in place of the radioactively labeled primers taught by Koster *et al.* in order to have provided an alternative labeling method that is safer to use as opposed to using radioactivity in the laboratory.

Art Unit: 1634

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford as applied to claims 1-6, 8, and 18-24 above, and further in view of Nazarenko *et al.* (US 6090552).

The teachings of Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford are applied herein as applied in the previous rejection. Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford do not teach methods wherein the reference DNA is methylated at all CpG positions.

However, the inclusion of a methylated control in an assay for the determination of methylation would have been routine at the time the invention was made. Nazarenko *et al.* teach methods for detecting methylation in samples, and teach the inclusion of methylated control nucleic acids in these assays and in kits for performing these assays (see Col. 37-38 and 49-50, for example). Thus, It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in the assays taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford *et al.* a control which is methylated at all CpG positions as taught by Nazarenko *et al.* in order to have had a standard for comparison of all results against those obtained with a methylated control.

### **Response to Remarks**

The remarks were previously addressed in the Advisory Action but are addressed again as follows. Regarding applicant's footnote on page 11, the reference to Herman and Hall is an editorial error and has been corrected. The examiner regrets the confusion. Likewise, the inclusion of rejected in the statement of rejection (see response page 12), has been corrected.

The claims have been amended to recite methods "consisting of" the recited steps. The methods taught by the combination of Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford are applied to even these

Art Unit: 1634

amended claims because the suggested method of the rejections of record would include all of these steps and would not require any steps outside of those recited. Each of the steps recited, for example in claim 1, include a number of different manipulations for the practice of the claimed step, and each is reasonably broad in nature. For example, Applicants argue on page 12 that the amendment of the claims to replace the transition term "comprising" with "consisting of" results in the claims now specifically excluding a sequencing step after fragments containing heteroduplexes are identified. However, this is not entirely accurate. First, claim 1 does not specifically include an "identifying" step as referred to in the argument. Instead, the final step of claim 1 recites "determining the position of 5-methylcytosine in the sample genomic DNA based on the presence and position of the detectable label." This step, as recited, could reasonably include a step wherein the "determining the position" occurs by sequencing the labeled molecules and noting the nucleotide present at the labeled position- thus determining the position "based on the presence and position of the detectable label." Further, as discussed in the rejection in this office action, Rice et al. suggest means for determining the position via use of hybridization to probes in an array, which does not require sequencing. Thus, even the claims which are narrowly drawn using "consisting of" language have sufficient breadth so as to include a potential sequencing step. The method suggested by Rice in view of Gifford (and the additional cited references for later claims) would have made obvious even the narrowly drawn claim as currently pending.

At page 13 of the response, applicant points out that Rice et al. does not teach or suggest any of steps (d)-(f) of claims 1 or 30, and that the rationale used by the office to set forth the obviousness rejection is flawed because "it presupposes that one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 1634

time of the invention would have been interested in knowing sites of cytosine methylation in a sample segment, without also knowing the entire sequence of the segment." This is not persuasive because (1) Rice et al. are in fact most interested in percent methylation at 30 CpG sites as compared to sites "within the known BRCA1 sequence" (p. 1181), they are not discovering or setting forth a newly discovered sequence and (2) even if Rice et al. were most interested in the sequence and the sequence context, Gifford specifically suggests that their method include a step to "determine the identity and position of the mismatch by determining the nucleotide sequence of the mismatch region (Col. 4, lines 7-9)." As previously noted in this action, the currently drawn claims do not exclude such determination, but only require that the determining of the position is "based on the presence and position of the detectable label." This step taught by Gifford is reasonably a method for carrying out such determination based on the presence and position of the detectable label.

Applicant points out that bisulfite treatment modifies sites of unmethylated cytosines, as is also stated in Rice et al. and in the rejection (page 14 of response, first full paragraph). Applicant further states that such treatment results in dramatic change to the treated sequence, and that insofar as the examiner envisions bisulfite treatment as a mechanism for introducing a mutation, the Office is in error "on multiple accounts." However, these multiple accounts are not mentioned, instead, the remarks continue with a second point. It is noted that Gifford specifically teaches that mismatched base pairs can arise via a variety of mechanisms, including "chemical modification of DNA (Col. 2, lines 50-51)." Thus, base differences between two sequences introduced via chemical modification (such as bisulfite treatment) clearly fall within the differences discussed by Gifford et al. In this case, Rice et al. treat a number of different

Art Unit: 1634

sequences with bisulfite, including samples from "normal" tissues, and then Rice et al. analyze the differential methylation of each relative to the other (see Figure 3). Sequence differences among the different samples in this case would have been the result of chemical modification. Applicant further argues that after treatment with bisulfite, two strands which were formally complementary normally do not anneal due to differences in sequence, and accordingly mismatching cannot occur. This is not persuasive. First, it is an attorney argument which is not supported by evidence on the record. Second, Rice et al. teach subsequent amplification of the treated molecules to produce a double strand which could then be compared to a reference sequence which was also bisulfite treated (Rice teaches comparing the bisulfite treated molecules to the "known" BRAC1 sequence). Further still, the method also encompasses the comparison of any of the bisulfite treated molecules of Rice et al. to one another in order to determine differences in methylation among them. Rice et al. treat a number of different sequences with bisulfite, including samples from "normal" tissues, and then Rice et al. analyze the differential methylation of each relative to the other (see Figure 3). Sequence differences among the different samples in this case would have been the result of chemical modification. The bisulfite treated molecules would only have differences at points of differential methylation, and thus would anneal. The rejection is maintained in view of these remarks.

Applicant attempts to construe Gifford as only being applicable to random event mutations, but this reading of Gifford is narrower than Gifford suggests, as previously noted where Gifford discusses different methods that mismatches are the result of chemical treatment of sequences. Finally, applicant's remarks regarding the "ascertainment of the sequence

Art Unit: 1634

context" have been previously addressed in this advisory action. Therefore, having carefully considered applicant's remarks, the rejection is MAINTAINED.

***Conclusion***

7. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Juliet C Switzer whose telephone number is (571) 272-0753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday or Thursday, from 9:00 AM until 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones can be reached by calling (571) 272-0745.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-0507.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.



Juliet C. Switzer  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1634

September 15, 2005